

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 12-20 are now pending in the application. Claims 7-11 have been cancelled. Claims 12-20 are new. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linksys WAP11 Instant Wireless Network Access Point – PracticallyNetworked.com (Tim Higgins, <http://practicallynetworked.com/review.asp?pid=400>”, relevant update 9/1/2001, hereinafter “Higgins”) in view of Tjalldin et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0014497, hereinafter “Tjalldin”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes claim 1 has been amended to include “a conversion module defining two connectors, a first connector interface port adapted to receive the first connector interface cable to receive the first networking signal from the connector interface cable and a second connector interface port for receiving a wireless networking interface card, the conversion module operable to convert the first networking signal into a second networking signal.” Applicant respectfully asserts that at least these features as claimed are not taught nor suggested by either Higgins nor Tjalldin either alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully asserts Higgins does not mention whatsoever a conversion module which is capable of interfacing a personal computing device through a first connector interface cable and a first connector interface port to a wireless networking card

for connecting the personal computing device to the wireless network via the wireless networking card as claimed. Applicant further notes that Tjalldin does not remedy the shortcomings of Higgins.

Tjalldin appears merely to disclose a bridge for communicating between two wireless networks (see at least [0014]). Tjalldin does not disclose whatsoever interfacing the wireless networks to a personal computing device and further does not mention whatsoever the use of an interface cable to communicate with a conversion module to interface the computing device with a wireless network through a wireless network card as presently claimed. In addition, Applicant notes that to modify the device of Tjalldin to include a connector interface port for a connector interface cable would impermissibly modify Tjalldin, as the primary purpose of Tjalldin is to enable users of the device to connect wirelessly between two different networks. (See at least paragraphs [0014], [0017]).

Accordingly, as neither Higgins nor Tjalldin, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention as called for in claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts claim 1 is patentable for at least these reasons. In addition, as claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 2-6 are also believed to be in condition for allowance for at least these reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgins in view of Tjalldin, and further in view of Bork et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,633,932, hereinafter “Bork”). As claims 8 and 9 have been cancelled, these rejections have been rendered moot. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New independent claim 12 includes “a second connector interface cable comprising a connector for connecting the apparatus to a Universal Serial Bus (USB) port in the computing device for receiving a source of power to power the apparatus,” and new independent claim 15 includes “wherein the wireless networking interface card is disposed in said conversion module and is in communication with said conversion module for interfacing the second networking signal with said wireless network on the aircraft, to thereby interface said computing device of the individual on the aircraft to said wireless network on the aircraft without first requiring modification to hardware of the computing device.” New independent Claim 18 includes “a second connector interface cable comprising a connector for connecting the apparatus to a port in the computing device for receiving a source of power to power the apparatus from the computing device of the individual.” Applicant respectfully submits neither Higgins nor Tjalldin teach Applicant’s invention as claimed in new independent claims 12, 15 and 18.

Higgins appears to disclose at best a large cumbersome router which must be coupled to an external power source such as an AC wall outlet. In addition, Tjalldin does not disclose whatsoever receiving a source of power from the computing device. In addition, both Higgins and Tjalldin are silent with regard to the use of their apparatus on a mobile platform. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits independent claims 12, 15 and 18 are patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as claims 13-15, 17, 19 and 20 each depend from either independent claim 12, 15 or 18, Applicant further believes these claims are also patentable and in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 27, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps